

James M. Wagstaffe (SBN 95535)  
**ADAMSKI MOROSKI MADDEN  
CUMBERLAND & GREEN LLP**  
P.O. Box 3835  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93403-3835  
Telephone: 805-543-0990  
Facsimile: 805-543-0980  
wagstaffe@ammcglaw.com

*Counsel for Plaintiffs Erica Frasco  
and Sarah Wellman*

Carol C. Villegas (*pro hac vice*)  
**LABATON KELLER SUCHAROW LLP**  
140 Broadway  
New York, NY 10005  
Telephone: (212) 907-0700  
Facsimile: (212) 818-0477  
cvillegas@labaton.com  
mcanty@labaton.com

*Co-Lead Class Counsel*

Christian Levis (*pro hac vice*)  
**LOWEY DANNENBERG, P.C.**  
44 South Broadway, Suite 1100  
White Plains, NY 10601  
Telephone: (914) 997-0500  
Facsimile: (914) 997-0035  
clevis@lowey.com  
afiorilla@lowey.com

*Co-Lead Class Counsel*

Diana J. Zinser (*pro hac vice*)  
**SPECTOR ROSEMAN & KODROFF, P.C.**  
2001 Market Street, Suite 3420  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 496-0300  
Facsimile: (215) 496-6611  
dzinser@srkattorneys.com  
jkodroff@srkattorneys.com

*Co-Lead Class Counsel*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

ERICA FRASCO, individually and on behalf of  
all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

FLO HEALTH, INC., GOOGLE, LLC,  
META PLATFORMS, INC., and FLURRY,  
INC.,

Defendants.

Civil Case No. 3:21-cv-00757-JD

**PLAINTIFFS' TRIAL BRIEF**

Judge: Hon. James Donato

1     **I. INTRODUCTION**

2           This case concerns the systematic collection, disclosure, and commercial exploitation of  
3 millions of women’s reproductive health information by Defendant Flo Health, Inc. (“Flo”), maker  
4 of the Flo Period & Ovulation Tracker mobile app (the “Flo App”), and two of the largest advertising  
5 and analytics companies: Defendants Google, LLC (“Google”) and Meta Platforms, Inc (“Meta”).

6           Flo created and marketed the Flo App as a tool for women to monitor their health information.  
7 Flo promised users that the Flo App would be a secure platform for privately tracking their sensitive  
8 health information. To use the Flo App, Flo App users need to complete a mandatory onboarding  
9 survey. This onboarding survey required users to select a “goal” indicating whether they are pregnant,  
10 want to be pregnant, or want to track their period, as well as input other information about their  
11 pregnancy or menstrual cycle.

12           Flo promised users Flo App users that their sensitive reproductive health information,  
13 including information entered in the Flo App onboarding survey, would not be disclosed. In reality,  
14 between November 1, 2016 and February 28, 2019 (the “Class Period”), Flo allowed Google and  
15 Meta via Custom App Events (“CAEs”) sent through their respective Software Development Kits  
16 (“SDKs”), incorporated in the Flo App.

17           Flo specifically named the CAEs to convey health information users entered in the app and  
18 designed its app to execute Google and Meta’s SDK code whenever these CAEs were triggered. As  
19 a result, Flo allowed Google and Meta to eavesdrop on users’ private in-app communications.

20           Each of the Defendants had their own purpose for collecting and using Flo user data. Flo used  
21 this information to acquire new app users through advertising and marketing, including  
22 advertisements based on Flo App users’ reproductive goals (*e.g.*, getting pregnant). Flo also sold  
23 access to the CAEs sent through SDKs to other third parties for profit. Google and Meta separately  
24 used the data they intercepted for their own commercial purposes, including to feed their machine  
25 learning algorithms that power each of their respective advertising networks.

26           Plaintiffs will prove at trial that they, like millions of other women who used the Flo App,  
27 were injured when the health information they privately entered in the Flo App was shared, recorded,

and used without their consent.

## **II. PLAINTIFFS' CLAIMS**

### **A. Claims Against Flo Health**

Plaintiffs assert the following claims on behalf of the Nationwide Damages Class against Flo:

(i) California Confidentiality of Medical Information Act, California Civil Code §§ 56 *et seq.* (“CMIA”), (ii) breach of contract, and (iii) intrusion upon seclusion. Plaintiffs also assert a claim on behalf of the California Subclass for Invasion of Privacy Claim against Flo under Art.1, Sec.1 of the California Constitution against Flo.

#### **1. CMIA**

The CMIA prohibits a “provider of health care” from sharing “any individually identifiable information, in electronic or physical form, in position of or derived from a provider of health care . . . regarding a patient’s medical history, . . . physical condition, or treatment.” Cal. Civ. Code §§ 56.10; 56.05(i); 56.05(o). The term “provider of health care” under § 56.06(b) includes “[a]ny business that offers software or hardware to consumers, *including a mobile application* or other related device that is designed to maintain medical information in order to make the information available to an individual . . .” (emphasis added). *See J.M. v. Illuminate Educ., Inc.*, 103 Cal. App. 5th 1125, 1131 (Cal. Ct. App. 2024) (explaining Cal. Civ. Code § 56.06(b) applies to an “education company” that uses software to “store[]” “mental health” information to provide “assistance” and “diagnose” student “needs”).

The evidence will unequivocally show that Flo is a “provider of health care” under the statute. Flo is a “business” that offers a “mobile application” (the Flo App) to “maintain medical information” (menstruation and pregnancy data) so the individual can “manage” that “information” or a “medical condition” (*i.e.*, track pregnancies and periods and receive health insights). The evidence will further show that Flo disclosed medical information without authorization in violation of Cal. Civ. Code § 56.05(i).

#### **2. Breach of Contract**

Breach of contract has four elements: (1) existence of a contract; (2) performance under the

1 contract; (3) Defendants’ breach; and (4) damages. *Roley v. Google LLC*, 2020 WL 8675968, at \*10  
 2 (N.D. Cal. July 20, 2020) (*citing First Comm. Mort. Co. v. Reece*, 89 Cal. App. 4th 731, 745 (2001)).

3 The evidence will show that Flo contractually agreed not to share Flo App users’ health  
 4 information, including survey results. The evidence will also show that Flo breached this agreement  
 5 by sharing Flo App users’ health data with Meta and Google.

### 6 **3. Intrusion Upon Seclusion**

7 Intrusion upon seclusion has two elements: “whether: (1) there exists a reasonable expectation  
 8 of privacy, and (2) the intrusion was highly offensive.” *In re Facebook, Inc. Internet Tracking Litig.*,  
 9 956 F.3d 589, 601 (9th Cir. 2020) (citation omitted). These elements are evaluated under an objective  
 10 standard. *See Rodriguez v. Google*, 2024 WL 38302 at \*4 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 3, 2024) (certifying intrusion  
 11 upon seclusion class and stating “the question of whether a reasonable expectation of privacy exists  
 12 is an objective one”); *Brown v. Google LLC*, 525 F. Supp. 3d 1049, 1076 (N.D. Cal. 2021) (explaining  
 13 standard is “objective[ ]”).

14 The evidence will show that a reasonable person would find Flo’s disclosure of users’ health  
 15 information to Meta and Google a highly offensive or unacceptable intrusion on their privacy.

### 16 **4. Invasion of Privacy Claim against Flo under Art.1, Sec.1 of the California** 17 **Constitution**

18 “Because of the similarity of the tests [for constitutional invasion of privacy and common law  
 19 intrusion claims], courts consider the claims together and ask whether: (1) there exists a reasonable  
 20 expectation of privacy, and (2) the intrusion was highly offensive.” *In re Facebook, Inc. Internet*  
 21 *Tracking Litig.*, 956 F.3d at 601.

22 As noted above, the evidence will confirm that Flo App users have a reasonable expectation  
 23 of privacy in their health information and that Flo’s disclosure of their health information was highly  
 24 offensive.

### 25 **B. Claim Against Ad Defendants**

26 Plaintiffs assert a claim arising under California Invasion of Privacy Act, California Penal  
 27 Code (“CIPA”) § 632 against Google and Meta, respectively.

1 Section 632 prohibits unauthorized recording or eavesdropping on confidential  
2 communications. *See In re Google Inc. Gmail Litig.*, 2013 WL 5423918, at \*22 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 26,  
3 2013); *see also In re Meta Pixel Healthcare Litig.*, 647 F. Supp.3d 778, 798 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 22,  
4 2022).

5 The evidence will show that Google and Meta’s SDKs were designed with the purpose of  
6 recording and eavesdropping on confidential in-app communications, including Plaintiffs’  
7 confidential in-app communications with Flo by capturing CAEs reflecting health information they  
8 entered into the Flo App. The evidence will further show that each Defendant engaged in this conduct  
9 without authorization.

### 10 **III. DEFENDANTS’ DEFENSES**

11 In their answers to Plaintiffs’ complaint, Defendants collectively asserted a total of 47  
12 affirmative defenses. Defendant Flo seeks jury instructions on three defenses: (i) consent; (ii)  
13 retroactive consent; and (iii) statute of limitations. Defendants Google and Meta solely seek a jury  
14 instruction on one defense: statute of limitations, as it relates to Plaintiffs’ CIPA § 632 claim.

15 Defendants’ statute of limitations defense will fail because the evidence irrefutably shows that  
16 Plaintiffs had no knowledge of Defendants’ wrongdoing until shortly before the filing of this case.  
17 Flo’s consent defense will fail because the evidence shows that Flo did not disclose it would share  
18 Flo App users’ private health data with third parties—it promised the opposite. Lastly, Flo’s  
19 retroactive consent defense will fail because it is not recognized by law. *See Javier v. Assurance IQ,*  
20 *LLC*, 2022 WL 1744107, at \*2 (9th Cir. May 31, 2022) (“no case shows that California has adopted  
21 retroactive consent as a defense to an invasion of privacy tort”).

### 22 **IV. CONCLUSION**

23 The evidence at trial will show that judgment should be entered for Plaintiffs on all their  
24 claims.

1 Dated: June 12, 2025

/s/ Carol C. Villegas

2 Carol C. Villegas (*pro hac vice*)  
3 Michael P. Canty (*pro hac vice*)  
4 Jake Bissell-Linsk (*pro hac vice*)  
5 Danielle Izzo (*pro hac vice*)  
6 Gloria J. Medina (*pro hac vice*)  
7 **LABATON KELLER SUCHAROW LLP**  
8 140 Broadway  
9 New York, NY 10005  
10 Telephone: (212) 907-0700  
11 Facsimile: (212) 818-0477  
12 cvillegas@labaton.com  
13 mcanty@labaton.com  
14 jbissell-linsk@labaton.com  
15 dizzo@labaton.com  
16 gmedina@labaton.com

17 *Co-Lead Class Counsel*

18 Christian Levis (*pro hac vice*)  
19 Amanda Fiorilla (*pro hac vice*)  
20 **LOWEY DANNENBERG, P.C.**  
21 44 South Broadway, Suite 1100  
22 White Plains, New York 10601  
23 Telephone: (914) 997-0500  
24 Facsimile: (914) 997-0035  
25 clevis@lowey.com  
26 afiorilla@lowey.com

27 *Co-Lead Class Counsel*

28 Diana J. Zinser (*pro hac vice*)  
Jeffrey L. Kodroff (*pro hac vice*)  
**SPECTOR ROSEMAN & KODROFF, P.C.**  
2001 Market Street, Suite 3420  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 496-0300  
Facsimile: (215) 496-6611  
dzinser@srkattorneys.com  
jkodroff@srkattorneys.com

*Co-Lead Class Counsel*

James M. Wagstaffe (SBN 95535)  
**ADAMSKI MOROSKI MADDEN**  
**CUMBERLAND & GREEN LLP**  
P.O. Box 3835  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93403-3835  
Tel: 805-543-0990

Fax: 805-543-0980  
wagstaffe@ammcglaw.com

*Counsel for Plaintiffs Erica Frasco and Sarah Wellman*

Ronald A. Marron (SBN 175650)  
Alexis M. Wood (SBN 270200)  
Kas L. Gallucci (SBN 288709)  
**LAW OFFICES OF RONALD A. MARRON**  
651 Arroyo Drive  
San Diego, CA 92103  
Telephone: (619) 696-9006  
Facsimile: (619) 564-6665  
ron@consumersadvocates.com  
alexis@consumersadvocates.com  
kas@consumersadvocates.com

*Counsel for Plaintiffs Jennifer Chen and Tesha Gamino*

Kent Morgan Williams (*pro hac vice*)  
**SIRI GLIMSTAD LLP**  
745 Fifth Avenue, Suite 500  
New York, NY 10151  
Telephone: (929) 220-2759  
kent.williams@sirillp.com

William Darryl Harris, II (*pro hac vice*)  
**HARRIS LEGAL ADVISORS LLC**  
3136 Kingsdale Center, Suite 246  
Columbus, OH 43221  
Telephone: (614) 504-3350  
Facsimile: (614) 340-1940  
will@harrislegaladvisors.com

*Counsel for Plaintiffs Leah Ridgway and Autumn Meigs*